

members of the body, this one is not the one that Senator Engel will stand up and say I wholeheartedly endorse it. This one begins to get at the crux of what I think the battle is going to be, and I hope the Legislature has the tenacity, I guess, or the will to make those decisions today rather than having the idea of, well, let's just move it along. We'll move it along, we'll make the decision later. Because I will tell those that have been here for a couple of years or that are just newly here, that that is the strategy we all try to use; well, let's just get the bill moved one time, and let's wait and see. And we all know that Select File, different things can happen. In fact, sometimes things are voice voted so fast when they come up that you don't have time to respond to, or the situation is different, or...then at some point on Select File traditionally the same argument will be used; well, let's just move it along one more time to Final Reading and see where the votes are, just give us a chance to get it to Final Reading. And then when we have bills on Final Reading that probably shouldn't be there, that when Final Reading comes, linkages are made and it's more difficult. This amendment simply says the following, notice, I am not offering to kill the bill. The idea of the bill, itself, I think has some merit, and I don't necessarily disagree with the fact. This amendment, basically, says, though, that, hey, listen, we just last week put in \$16 million up front for ethanol. Now in the bill originally as it was, there was only 8 million total dollars, so we added about, obviously, we added 8 million more dollars in the next two years of the biennium, and then we front loaded a little bit more in the second biennium, and then what we did is eliminated the 28 million dollar cliff that we would have had on ethanol in the third biennium which makes eminent sense that we don't have a cliff at the end when we are having fiscal difficulties, that when we have more of an ability to control fiscal matters that we front load that. But over the last few days of those that have read the papers and looked at the media and maybe talked with constituents, obviously, there is kind of an attitude out there, which I concur with. They are saying, look, if we are going to front load on ethanol, we'd better be...have enough courage to find the dollars for it, and so this amendment, basically, does the following. It deletes the number 3 and puts in 500,000, and in the second year it deletes the number 3, 3 million, and puts in 500,000. So it will say over a two period, we, as the Legislature, are willing to put in a million dollars, 500,000 in each of the next two years, and also what we are saying is that since the whole concept was 6, we will be putting in a million,